From: MZAHNER --VCH0021A Date and time 05/12/89 10:48:52
To: FDULLES --VCH0021A Frederick Dulles

From: Steven C. Parrish
Subject:

As you, Bernie, and I have discussed, my attempts to implement "an action plan for countering the product liability misinformation" in the Aho case have been effectively thwarted thus far by the two defendants in the case, Stoy and Rettig. This is true for a number of reasons, including the following:

1. Finnish counsel (including outside counsel for Amer) have said they do not believe there is a public relations problem.

2. Finnish counsel have stated in no uncertain terms that they believe attempts by us to tell our side of the story at this time would not be favorably received by the court and could hurt the defendants' chances of winning the case.

3. General counsel for BAT (Stoy's parent) and assistant general counsel for RJR (licensor of Rettig) are very reluctant to go against the advice of their local counsel on this issue.

As I mentioned to Bernie earlier, perhaps the best approach is for someone to provide me with copies (and translations, if possible) of the negative press so that I can more effectively argue "my case" on this issue.

I know Bernie is frustrated. I am at least as frustrated about this as he is. Nevertheless, it is difficult to move these people when their local counsel say (a) there is no problem, (b) if we do anything it will hurt their chances of winning the case, and (c) neither Philip Morris nor Amer is a party to the case.

Regards,
Steve Parrish

cc: CVONMAER--VUS0212A Cynthia Von Maeres

2024961550

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xhyv0003